## Exhibit A

11/03/2006

		1/03/200
08:47:27		Page 1
08:47:27	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
08:47:27	FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS	
08:47:27	TU DE	
08:47:27	IN RE:	
08:47:27	CONVICT NETWORKS	
08:47:27	SONUS NETWORKS, INC.,	
08:47:27	LITIGATION	
08:47:27	Civil Action No.	
08:47:27	04-10294-DPW	
08:47:27	Lead Case	
08:47:27	*	
20.11.21	9:30 a.m.	
08:47:27	November 3, 2006	-
08:47:27	399 Park Avenue	
08:47:27	New York, New York	
08:47:27	DEPOSITION of JOHN FRANCIS MYKLUSCH, a Witness in the above entitled matter, taken pursuant to Notice, before Stephen J. Moore, a Registered Professional Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter, and Notary Public of the State of New York.	
- L		I

11/03/2006

09:42:49 1		Page 9
	JOHN MYKLUSCH	:
09:42:50 2	Q What is your position, for	
09:42:50 3	shorthand is it okay if I refer to it as	
09:42:51 4	Trilogy?	ļ
09:42:52 5	A That's fine.	
09:42:54 6	Q What is your position at	
09:43:65 7	Trilogy?	
09:43:06 8	A I am the Chief Financial Officer	
09:43:11 9	and I am the Chief Compliance Officer.	
09:43:13 10	Q What are your duties and	}
09:43:16 11	responsibilities as Chief Financial Officer?	
09:43:18 12	A It's the financial management of	
09:43:21 13	Trilogy Global Advisors as an entity as it	
09:43:33 14	relates to our current business plan, or our	
09:43:35 15	current goals of the entity, so fiscal	
09:43:38 16	management.	
09:43:40 17	Q On a day-to-day basis what does	
09:43:45 18	that entail?	
09:43:51 19	A Interacting with my Comptroller	
09:43:55 20	on different financial matters, reviewing	
09:44:00 21	client contracts, ensuring appropriate payments	
09:44:03 22	have gone in, fiscal matters are done in a	
23	correct way, budgeting, it can be any one of a	
24	number of fiscally related items.	
25	Q You mentioned interacting with	
		ı

LegaLink Boston, Merrill Legal Solutions (617) 542-0039

		Page 11
09:45:29 1	JOHN MYKLUSCH	1090 11
09:45:37 2	we review talk to traders, we review trades,	
09:45:38 3	we view guidelines in association with the	
09:45:40 4	remainder of the Trilogy compliance staff.	
09:45:42 5	Q What percentage of your time	
09:45:45 6	would you estimate you spend on your duties as	
09:45:48 7	Chief Compliance Officer?	
09:45:59 8	A It varies. On a day-to-day	
09:46:01 9	basis I would say my role is probably 50	
09:46:03 10	percent each, on an average for a year.	
09:46:03 11	Q How long have you been the Chief	
09:46:07 12	Financial Officer?	
09:46:12 13	A I have been the Chief Financial	
09:46:15 14	Officer of Trilogy Global Advisors since it was	
09:46:17 15	created.	:
09:46:19 16	Q So, you are currently employed	
09:46:24 17	by Trilogy Global Advisors. Are you employed	
09:46:25 18	by any other entities?	
09:46:27 19	A Right now I am not.	
09:46:31 20	Q Were you previously employed by	
09:46:34 21	other entities?	;
09:46:36 22	A At the time in between when BPI	
23	and Trilogy had merged completely up into	
24	Trilogy Global Advisors, I would say that I had	
25	a dual officer role of my titles within BPI	

		Page 12
09:46:50 1	JOHN MYKLUSCH	<i></i>
09:46:53 2	Global Asset Management, Trilogy Advisors and	
09:46:58 3	Trilogy Global Advisors, although I did not	
09:47:03 4	carry a Chief Compliance Officer title the	
09:47:09 5	entire period of time that BPI Global Asset	
09:47:10 6	Management and Trilogy Advisors were still	
09:47:11 7	underneath Trilogy Global Advisors.	
09:47:13 8	Q Does Trilogy Advisors still	
09:47:15 9	exist?	
09:47:17 10	A Trilogy Advisors has been merged	
09:47:20 11	into Trilogy Global Advisors.	i
09:47:22 12	Q That was the entity that existed	
09:47:30 13	and merged with BPI Global Asset Management?	
09:47:32 14	A That's correct I'm sorry,	;
09:47:34 15	Trilogy Advisors and BPI in the process of	ļ
09:47:36 16	merging were deemed 100 percent of their equity	
09:47:38 17	up into Trilogy Global Advisors.	}
09:47:44 18	So these entities didn't merge	
09:47:46 19	directly together, they merged up into Trilogy	
09:47:49 20	Global Advisors.	
09:47:51 21	Q Who is your supervisor now?	
09:47:52 22	A Right now I report to Carol	
23	Holley, and Ryan Burrow.	
24	Q Can you spell those names for	
25	the record, please?	

		Page 13
09:48:06 ]	JOHN MYKLUSCH	-
09:48:07 2	A C-a-r-o-l H-o-l-l-e-y and	
09:48:10 3	R-y-a-n B-u-r-r-o-w.	
09:48:14 4	Q What are their positions?	
09:48:19 5	A Ryan Burrow is a managing	
09:48:22 6	director with Trilogy Global Advisors and he	
09:48:27 7	sits on the board, Trilogy Global Advisors, and	
09:48:31 8	Carol Holley is the Chief Operating Officer for	
09:48:34 9	Trilogy Global Advisors and a managing director	
09:48:38 10	of Trilogy Global Advisors.	
09:48:42 11	As Chief Compliance Officer I	
09:48:47 12	also report directly to the Board of Directors	
09:48:53 13	of Trilogy Global Advisors on compliance	
09:48:54 14	related issues as is required or as is desired	
09:48:56 15	under the Compliance Officer rule.	
09:48:59 16	Q Do you supervise anyone?	
09:49:01 17	A I supervise two individuals	
09:49:02 18	under me on the compliance side and two	
09:49:03 19	individuals on the finance side.	ļ
09:49:07 20	Q Who are those individuals on the	
09:49:08 21	finance side?	
09:49:11 22	MR. CERA: I object. How does	
23	this relate to what we are here about	
24	which is the topics certain of the	
25	topics in the notice?	ĺ

11/03/2006

		Page	14
C9:49:17 :	JOHN MYKLUSCH	_	
09:49:18 2	Why does it matter? Where is the		
09:49:22 3	relevance of it?		
09:49:23 4	MS. COFFEY: You can go ahead and		
09:49:28 5	answer the question.		
09:49:41 6	A On the finance side Rose		
09:49:43 7	Blechner who is the Comptroller and Camille		
09:49:43 8	Whitsett.		
09:49:47 9	Q What's Camille Whitsett's		
09:49:49 10	position?		į
09:49:51 11	A Camille is a Vice President		
09:49:59 12	with she is either a Vice President or an		
09:50:00 13	associate currently, I am not sure as to which		
09:50:05 14	title she currently holds.		
09:50:07 15	Q So you have been employed by		
09:50:08 16	Trilogy since the merger in 2004, correct?		
09:50:10 17	A I was employed before that and		
09:50:12 18	after that.		
09:50:13 19	Q Right, and before the merger you		
09:50:18 20	were employed by BPI?		
09:50:19 21	A Trilogy Global, I have worked		
09:50:23 22	for Trilogy Global Advisors.		
23	MR. CERA: Go ahead, let him		
24	finish.		
25	A In 1999 I began working with		
•			1

		Page 15
09:50:36 1	JOHN MYKLUSCH	-
19:53:42 2	Trilogy Advisors. When we merged I became a	
09:50:48 3	dual officer and dual titles with BPI and	
09:50:49 4	Trilogy Advisors and Trilogy Global Advisors	
09:50:51 5	and I hold the majority of those titles today.	
09:50:53 6	Q So in 1999 when you began	
09:50:54 7	working with Trilogy Advisors what was your	
09:51:00 8	position?	
09:51:04 9	A I was the Chief Financial	
09:51:08 10	Officer and Compliance Officer, and I did not	
09:51:12 11	take on a Chief Compliance Officer role until I	
09:51:14 12	believe it was mandated by the rule that the	
09:51:16 13	SEC has most recently passed regarding that.	
09:51:17 14	Q Did those positions change prior	
09:51:18 15	to the merger?	
09:51:20 16	A Do you mean did the titles	
09:51:22 17	change?	
09:51:27 18	Q Yes.	
09:51:30 19	A I believe the rule required	
09:51:31 20	was I believe the rule for Chief compliance	
09:51:33 21	officers predated our merger, so yes.	
09:51:35 22	Q Otherwise were there any changes	]
23	in your titles prior to the merger?	ļ
24	A I most likely have received some	
25	merit increases, I believe I started as a Vice	
'		1

11/03/2006

Page 23 10:00:15 1 JOHN MYKLUSCH 10:00:17 2 To your knowledge was that the Q 10:00:19 3 certification filed with the lead Plaintiff 10:00:20 4 motion? 10:00:29 5 I do not know which document it 10:00:30 6 was entirely, but it was a document that was 10:00:32 7 filed with the court. 10:00:38 8 Anything else that you reviewed 10:00:40 9 that refreshed your recollection? 10:00:43 10 Α None that I can recall. 10:00:46 11 Have you spoken with anyone else Q 10:00:53 12 about this case? 10:00:56 13 I have spoken probably to people 10:00:57 14 that I know and I also had a conversation with 10:00:59 15 counsel about --10:01:00 16 MR. CERA: Wait, wait, wait, you 10:01:01 17 don't have to reveal the substance of 10:01:05 18 conversations with counsel. 10:01:07 19 And I wouldn't ask you to do 10:01:13 20 When you say people that you know -that. 10:01:15 21 Contacts in the industry, just A 10:01:18 22 about this type of legislation and law, just 23 doing due diligence on my own behalf about what is involved in the process and what to expect 24 25 and what other people have seen.

		Page 28
10:06:50 1	JOHN MYKLUSCH	y v
10:06:56 2	A During the period from the	
10:06:59 3	merger up until the period in which he departed	
10:07:C4 4	from the company he was employed, I don't want	
10:07:06 5	to say the entire time, but his role was	
10:07:08 6	primarily Chief Compliance Officer.	
10:07:27 7	Q When did he leave Trilogy?	
10:07:28 8	A I don't know the exact date, but	
10:07:31 9	I believe it was the fourth quarter of 2005.	
10:07:33 10	Q During the period Charles	
10:07:35 11	Sweeney was Chief Compliance Officer you were	
10:07:37 12	not holding that position?	
10:07:38 13	A That's correct.	
10:07:45 14	Q So when in 2004 did the merger	
10:07:53 15	happen?	
10:07:54 16	A It happened on May 31, 2005.	
10:07:56 17	Q 2005.	
10:07:58 18	To your knowledge what is	
10:08:01 19	Charles Sweeney's reputation?	
10:08:02 20	MR. CERA: I object to the form,	
10:08:05 21	calls for speculation.	
10:08:06 22	A I do not	
23	MR. CERA: Vague, ambiguous.	
24	Q What are your impressions of	
25	Mr. Sweeney?	

		Page 42
10:24:12 1	JOHN MYKLUSCH	2 4 g 0 1 1 2
10:24:15 2	be.	
10:24:17 3	Q When did you become aware of the	
10:24:21 4	Sonus lawsuit?	
10:24:27 5	A I am not certain, although it	
10:24:29 6	would have somewhere between six months	
10:24:32 7	before and six months after we merged.	
10:24:34 8	Q Who made you aware of the Sonus	į
10:24:36 9	case?	
10:24:38 10	A It was either Chuck Sweeney or	
10:24:39 11	Michael Kileen.	
10:25:00 12	Q Can you spell that last -	
10:25:03 13	Michael's last name?	
10:25:03 14	A K-i-l-e-e-n.	
10:25:05 15	Q What is Michael Kileen's	
10:25:07 16	position?	
10:25:15 17	A I believe he's the Chief counsel	
10:25:16 18	of CI, although I don't think that's his exact	
10:25:19 19	title.	
10:25:21 20	Q Why were you discussing the	
10:25:28 21	Sonus case with Michael Kileen?	
10:25:30 22	MR. CERA: You know, let me just	
23	think about this for a moment.	
24	I'm not sure that his conversations	
25	with the Chief counsel of CI is a subject	
L.		

Page 44 10:16:26 1 JOHN MYKLUSCH 16:26:28 Q Why did you speak with 10:26:30 3 Mr. Sweeney about the Sonus case? 10:26:32 4 Because I would consider him to 10:26:35 5 be one of the more knowledgeable persons about 10:26:36 6 what had gone on or where the case stood or the 10:26:41 7 positions that BPI had. 10:26:44 8 Q Have you read the complaint in 10:26:47 9 this case? 10:26:48 10 I have read the complaint, I 10:26:49 11 don't know if I read every word, but I read the 10:26:50 12 majority of it. 10:26:53 13 Q Do you know the basic 10:26:54 14 allegations? 10:27:00 15 Α I do know the basic allegation. 10:27:09 16 Could you describe it? 0 10:27:12 17 My understanding is that Sonus 10:27:21 18 had made what were allegedly misstatements in 10:27:24 19 securities filings and there are instances 10:27:31 20 of -- alleged instances of revenue manipulation 10:27:32 21 inside of these filings which required 10:27:36 22 restatements to these filings. 23 Do you know how BPI Global came Q to be a Plaintiff in this case? 24 25 I was not affiliated at the А

11/03/2006

		Page 45
10:27:42 1	JOHN MYKLUSCH	rage 45
19:27:43 2	time, so no.	
10:27:45 3	Q Do you know where the lawsuit is	
10:27:45 4	pending?	
10:27:48 5	A In Boston, I believe.	
10:27:49 6	Q Do you know if it's state or	İ
10:27:53 7	federal court?	
10:27:55 8	A I believe the charges are	
10:27:56 9	securities are federal, so it would have to be	
10:27:57 10	a federal court.	
10:28:00 11	Q Do you know what the status of	
10:28:03 12	this case is?	
10:28:04 13	A I believe it is awaiting class	
10:28:05 14	action certification, which is where it stands	
10:28:10 15	today.	
10:28:13 16	Q Do you know the name of the	
10:28:16 17	judge?	
10:28:17 18	A I know it starts with a W, I	
10:28:19 19	don't recall his exact last name.	
10:28:20 20	Q Do you know if there has been a	
10:28:32 21	trial set in this case?	
10:28:35 22	A I believe there has been a date	
23	set for February next year.	
24	Q Other than Mr. Sweeney, have	
25	you and Mr. Kileen, have you spoken to	
L		ĺ

Page 46 10:28:44 JOHN MYKLUSCH 10:28:48 anyone else about this litigation? 10:28:51 3 I discussed earlier that I 10:18:56 4 discussed this litigation with several 10:28:58 5 colleagues in the industry. 10:28:59 6 Anyone else other than Mr. Cera Q 10:29:04 7 and Ms. Markert? 10:29:06 8 I would say the management of 10:29:08 9 Trilogy has been kept apprised at a generic 10:29:11 10 level of the case. 10:29:12 11 What has your involvement in 10:29:12 12 this case thus far entailed? 10:29:13 13 MR. CERA: I object to form. 10:29:17 14 ahead. 10:29:20 15 I would say from the point in 10:29:23 16 which I picked it up, the two matters that I 10:29:29 17 was involved most closely with were the 10:29:34 18 interrogatories which are mentioned in this 10:29:38 19 document in front of me, and the document 10:29:39 20 collection. 10:29:41 21 0 Anything else? 10:29:48 22 Probably had a number of 23 conversations with counsel surrounding the Sonus case, in particular when I picked up 24 25 after Chuck had left the company, I had a

		Page 47
19:29:59 1	JOHN MYKLUSCH	- ~ 90 17
10:30:00 2	number of discussions about the status of the	
10:30:04 3	case, where we stood with counsel.	
10:30:07 4	Q Anything else?	
10:30:08 5	A I would say that's a fair	
10:30:11 6	assessment.	ļ
10:30:14 7	Q Other than the time you spent	:
10:30:17 8	preparing for your deposition and any travel,	
10:30:20 9	likely not much, you needed to come here, how	
10:30:21 10	much time have you spent on this lawsuit?	
10:30:23 11		
10:30:36 12	MR. CERA: I object to form.  A I would say the days	
10:30:38 13	A I would say the document collection probably took up a decent amount of	
10:30:42 14		
10:30:44 15	my time, it was a pretty comprehensive process.	
10:30:47 16	It's difficult to figure out	
10:30:48 17	exactly how much time, but it was substantial	
10:30:56 18	enough so it took me away from a number of other things.	
10:30:57 19		
10:31:04 20	Q Do you have any estimate as to	
10:31:07 21	how much time that was?	
10:31:09 22	A Somewhere between a week and	
23	three weeks spread over a period of time of my	
	involvement.	
24	Q Other than in preparing for your	
25	deposition, have you reviewed any documents in	

		,05,	2000
10:31:17 1		Page	48
10:31:22 2	JOHN MYKLUSCH		
10:31:27 3	this case?		
	MR. CERA: I object to form.		
10:31:29 4	A Interrogatories.		
10:31:31 5	MR. CERA: I mean he's already		
10:31:32 6	previously told you he reviewed the		
10:31:34 7	order of May 2006. He said he reviewed		
10:31:37 8	the complaint, are you asking in		
10:31:37 9	addition to those matters if he's		
10:31:38 10	reviewed the document request?		
10:31:38 11	MS. COFFEY: Is that an		
10:31:40 12	objection?		
10:31:41 13	MR. CERA: Yes, because I think		
10:31:42 14	it's been asked and answered. Are you		
10:31:44 15	asking in addition to those items?		
10:31:45 16	į.		
10:31:47 17	Q As I said, other than the documents you reviewed in preparation for this		
10:31:49 18	deposition, have you reviewed any other		
10:31:52 19	documents in your involvement in this case?		
10:31:55 20			
10:31:57 21	A Chuck Sweeney had kept a file with all the documents he had on the Sonus		
10:32:00 22			
23	case, I think at the time of my inception of my		
24	involvement I probably reviewed the entire		
25	file.		
<u> </u>	I could not tell you what is in		
	Togati in a		j

		Page 49
10:32:06 1	JOHN MYKLUSCH	
10:32:07 2	that file today.	
10:32:07 j	Q You've been involved in document	
10:32:09 4	collection efforts?	
10:32:10 5	A That's correct.	
10:32:12 6	Q Have you reviewed any of the	
10:32:15 /	documents collected?	
10:32:17 8	A I reviewed some of the documents	
10:32:18 9	that were collected, but I have not reviewed	
10:32:20 10	all of the documents that were collected.	
10:32:22 11	Q Who else reviewed the documents	
10:32:25 12	that were collected?	
10:32:27 13	A I would have to assume counsel	
10:32:29 14	reviewed the documents that were collected, and	
10:32:33 15	then have to assume the individuals who were	
10:32:36 16	assigned to assist the document collection	
10:32:37 17	process reviewed those documents as they were	
10:32:39 18	obtained.	
10:32:49 19	Q Who were the individuals	
10:32:54 20	assigned to assist with the document collection	
10:33:02 21	process?	
10:33:06 22	A Evelyn Jones, Ellen Miller,	
23	Arroyo, I am going to mispronounce her name,	
24	its Guardine, I would need to get the spelling,	
25	I don't have it offhand, and Jason Human.	

10:33:18 1	JOHN MYKLUSCH	Page 50
10:33:21 2		
10:33:32 3	100 Speri his hame?	i
10:33:36 4	n a m a n.	
10:33:41 5	In addition, Carol Holley was	
	involved, more from directing the process, and	!
10:33:43 6	Stephen Steffy was involved in directing the	
10:33:45 7	process.	ļ
10:33:50 8	I have to assume that when we	
10:33:53 9	gave counsel the ability to interview whoever	
10:33:56 10	she felt necessary, Pamela Markert was in that	:
10:34:03 11	office, that a number of other people in that	
10:34:04 12	office were also spoken to and were involved in	
10:34:06 13	some form or fashion.	
10:34:09 14		
10:34:12 15	and you give counsel the	
10:34:15 16	ability to interview whoever counsel felt	
10:34:21 17	necessary?	
	MR. CERA: Objection to the form.	
10:34:23 18	A Pamela Markert visited the 1900	
10:34:25 19	Summit Tower Office, I was actually there for	
10:34:26 20	at least one of the days, although I do not	
10:34:27 21	recall which day it was.	
10:34:29 22	My understanding is counsel was	
23	there for the entire week.	
24	Q Approximately when was that?	
25	A I do not remember. Beginning of	

		11/03/2006
10:44:02 1		Page 52
	JOHN MYKLUSCH	
10:44:04 2	the investment person, so not the trader.	
10:44:09 3	Q Who is the trader?	
10:44:11 4	A His name was Kyle, Kyle Anderson	
10:44:11 5	was his name.	
10:44:17 6	Q What was Dan Jaworski's	
10:44:19 7	position?	
10:44:22 8	A My understanding is CIO.	
10:44:24 9	Q What about John Sorenson?	
10:44:33 10	A I do not know the titles of the	
10:44:41 11	remainder of those individuals.	
10:44:42 12	Q Or Paul Holland?	
10:44:47 13	A No.	
10:45:48 14	Q We have been talking about this	
10:45:49 15	merger between can we go off the record.	
10:45:53 16	(Discussion off the record.)	
10:45:54 17	MS. COFFEY: We can go back on	
10:45:59 18	the record now.	
10:46:03 19	Q Perhaps it's a good time to	
10:46:07 20	clarify, does BPI Global currently exist?	
10:46:10 21	A BPI Global Advisors was merged	
10:46:15 22	up and into Trilogy Global Advisors, but in the	
23	merger agreement we left a stipulation so that	
24	lawsuits in its name could proceed in its name.	
25	Q Other than that stipulation does	

		Page 108
11:54:05 1	JOHN MYKLUSCH	
11:54:06 2	Plaintiff's response to interrogatory number 8.	
11:54:08 3	What was the process for	
11:54:11 4	responding to this interrogatory?	
11:54:17 5	A This is the document discovery	
11:54:18 6	process which we feel was a pretty	
11:54:20 7	comprehensive process.	
11:54:21 8	Q Interrogatory number 10,	
11:54:23 9	identify any fee arrangement or agreement	
11:54:25 10	between you and any person regarding the	
11:54:27 11	payment of attorneys' fees or costs in this	
11:54:29 12	action.	
11:54:31 13	The response references a	
11:54:34 14	responsive document which I believe is the fee	
11:54:36 15	arrangement, the engagement letter between BPI	
11:54:37 16	and Mr. Cera's law firm.	
11:54:38 17	Are you aware of any other fee	
11:54:40 18	arrangement or fee agreement?	
11:54:42 19	A No.	
11:54:43 20	Q What was done to respond to this	ļ
11:54:46 21	request?	
11:54:50 22	A I had seen that letter and my	
23	understanding is a copy I believe a redacted	
24	copy of that letter was provided.	
25	Q Was there any investigation into	
Ł		1

11:57:12 1	JOHN MYKLUSCH	Page 111
11:57:12 2	record.	
32:35:18 3	(At this point in the proceedings	
12:35:19 4	there was a luncheon recess, after which	
12:35:20 5	the deposition continued as follows:)	
12:35:22 6	MR. CERA: Before we begin, I	
12:35:23 7	wanted to say that we have considered	
12:35:27 8	your request that you be allowed to	
12:35:28 9	inquire into the communications with	
12:35:30 10	Mr. Kileen and you may go ahead and do	
12:35:32 11	so.	
12:35:35 12	MS. COFFEY: Okay, thank you.	ļ
12:35:38 13	Q Mr. Myklusch, welcome back, I	
12:35:40 14	hope you had a good break.	
12:35:43 15	Let's return to that now, the	
12:35:46 16	issue of your conversations with Michael Kileen	
12:35:48 17	who was counsel for CI Mutual Funds regarding	į
12:35:50 18	this litigation.	
12:35:51 19	What was the substance of your	
12:35:59 20	conversations with Mr. Kileen?	
12:36:01 21	A We had discussions regarding the	j
12:36:02 22	broad strokes of the Sonus suit.	
23	Q How many discussions occurred?	
24	A I think we had two discussions	
25	regarding Sonus.	

30 00 00		Page 112
12:36:07 1	JOHN MYKLUSCH	
12:36:09 2	Q Who initiated those discussions?	
12:36:09 3	A I did in both instances.	
12:36:12 4	Q Why did you initiate those	
12:36:17 5	discussions.	
12:36:21 6	A In the first instance it was	
12:36:23 7	when I had, I would say, picked up where Chuck	
12:36:28 8	left off with regard to Sonus, just his general	
12:36:31 9	knowledge of the case and just broad strokes	
12:36:35 10	about the Sonus case, and the second was in the	
12:36:41 11	case of when we were required to provide	
12:36:43 12	documents, I solicited Mike Kileen's help with	
12:36:45 13	the delivery of documents that were requested.	
12:36:47 14	Q Why did you, regarding you	
12:36:50 15	picking up where Mr. Sweeney left off, why did	
12:36:53 16	you speak to Mr. Kileen instead of Mr. Sweeney	
12:36:55 17	at that time?	
12:36:58 18	MR. CERA: I object to the form.	
12:37:02 19	A CI had owned a very large stake	,
12:37:05 20	in BPI, would have been involved in the matter	
12:37:11 21	in some form or fashion, and I wanted to	
12:37:16 22	understand that he did know about the case and	
23	what he knew about the case, just very general	
24	what's out there.	
<u> </u>	Q Do you remember specifically	
Ĺ	-	ŀ

11/03/2006

		Page 113
12:37:19 1	JOHN MYKLUSCH	
12:37:20 2	what was said during either of your	
12:37:22 3	discussions?	
12:37:27 4	A I really have no knowledge. I	į
12:37:29 5	know we talked about Sonus in generalities, I	:
12:37:35 6	don't think there was anything specific, but as	
12:37:37 7	to the context of what we actually talked	,
12:37:40 8	about, I really don't know. I don't remember.	
12:37:41 9	Q Why did you solicit Mike	
12:37:43 10	Kileen's help regarding the document	
12:37:46 11	collection?	
12:37:52 12	A Because a number of the funds	
12:37:54 13	are CI funds, and it seemed to be an excellent	
12:37:56 14	way for us to ensure we had all the documents	
12:38:00 15	or as many of the documents as we could bring	
12:38:00 16	to the table.	
12:38:02 17	Q What assistance did he provide	
12:38:06 18	You?	
12:38:07 19	A They searched, I'm not certain	
12:38:09 20	to the extent of the procedures that he or	
12:38:13 21	people that worked for him went through.	
12:38:14 22	I do know, however, that they	
23	did deliver to us a number of documents.	
24	Q What were the documents that	
25	they delivered to you?	
Ĺ		ļ

LegaLink Boston, Merrill Legal Solutions (617) 542-0039

		Page	117
18:42:54 1	JOHN MYKLUSCH	-	
12:42:57 2	documents, I don't think so.		
12:42:59 3	Q Can you walk me through your		
12:43:02 4	process in collecting documents?		
12:43:04 5	MR. CERA: Asked and answered		
12:43:04 6	previously at length.		
12:43:69	You can go ahead and answer it		
12:43:10 8	again.		
12:43:11 9	A We identify a group of		
12:43:13 10	individuals that would be best suited for		
12:43:13 11	looking for documents in here.		
12:43:15 12	Q That's the document collection		ļ
12:43:17 13	team?		
12:43:19 14	A The document collection team,		
12:43:21 15	some of the individuals were people that would		
12:43:26 16	actually be doing the looking, some of the		
12:43:30 17	people were people we would talk to about		
12:43:34 18	either we or I talked to about how, where we		
12:43:37 19	should be looking for these documents.		
12:43:42 20	We provided counsel with every		
12:43:45 21	single backup tape, computer backup tape we		İ
12:43:49 22	could find on our premises I'm sorry, in the		
23	Florida office those are tapes that would have		
24	backed up BPI's systems.		
25	I believe counsel has gone		

		Page 118
12:43:56 1	JOHN MYKLUSCH	-
12:44:01 2	through a pretty arduous process of recovery	
12:44:03 3	and examining those, and I believe those were	
12:44:04 4	provided in were provided in there to	
12:44:07 5	counsel already, provided to you already.	
12:44:08 6	Q When did you provide counsel	
12:44:10 7	with those backup tapes?	
12:44:14 8	A I don't know the exact date,	
12:44:15 9	although I believe it was at the same time	
12:44:17 10	which counsel visited the Florida office.	
12:44:18 11	Q When do you think that was?	
12:44:21 12	A I do not recall the date.	
12:44:22 13	Q Was it after you had begun the	
32:44:26 14	document collection process?	
12:44:27 15	A I believe I had received this	
12:44:29 16	document prior to counsel's appearance in our	
12:44:30 17	Florida office.	
12:44:32 18	Q Do you have any sense of how	
12:44:33 19	much time passed between when you received this	
12:44:40 20	document and when counsel arrived at your	
2:44:41 21	Florida office?	
2:44:43 22	A No, I don't.	
23	Q Now, you mentioned on the	
24	document collection team some of those people	
25	were the ones who, I think in your words,	

14:40:55 1	JOHN MYKLUSCH	Page	200
14:40:55 2	MS. COFFEY: I think those are		
14:40:56 3	all my questions, do you have additional		i
14:40:59 4	questions?		
14:40:59 5	MR. MATULE: I just have a		
14:40:59 6	handful of questions.		
14:41:03 7			
14:41:05 8	EXAMINATION BY MR. MATULE:		
14:41:07 9			
14:41:07 10	MR. CERA: This is counsel for		
14:41:12 11	Mr. Nill.		
14:41:17 12	Q Matt Matule of Skadden, Arps,		
14:41:18 13	Slate, Meagher & Flom, Boston on behalf of		
14:41:21 14	Stephen Nill.		
14:41:23 15	Mr. Myklusch, do you know who		
14:41:29 16	Stephen Nill is?		
14:41:32 17	A I know that Stephen Nill was a		
14:41:33 18	control person within Sonus, I believe he was		
14:41:36 19	the CFO.		
14:41:40 20	Q What do you mean by he was a		
14:41:42 21	control person?		
14:41:58 22	A CFO would be a listed officer,		
23	he had the ability to control operations of the		
24	company.		
25	Q Is that how you view your role		

		Page 203
14:44:28 1	JOHN MYKLUSCH	
14:44:33 2	case.	
14:44:50 3	Q Mr. Myklusch, is it your	
14:44:52 4	contention in this case that the restatement at	
14:44:58 5	Sonus in July of 2004 was as a result of fraud?	
14:45:00 6	A Revenue manipulation would be a	
14:45:02 7	fraud, so yes, I think the primary driver is a	
14:45:05 8	fraud at issue.	
14:45:08 9	Q Are you aware of any facts	
14:45:09 16	supporting such contention that there was	
14:45:11 11	fraud?	
14:45:14 12	A I know the broad strokes of the	
14:45:17 13	case, but I do not know the exact details	
14:45:18 14	behind the exact specific instances or frauds	
14:45:20 15	that are alleged.	
14:45:22 16	Q It's fair to say, is it not,	
14:45:23 17	that you don't have any personal knowledge	
14:45:24 18	about any of the allegations in the Complaint?	
14:45:28 19	MR. CERA: Well, hold on a	3
14:45:29 20	second.	
14:45:32 21	That's overbroad. Any of the	
14:45:34 22	allegations like the Plaintiff purchased	
23	Sonus securities?	
24	I mean are you talking about the	
25	underlying charging allegations of	}

		Page	205
14:46:34 1	JOHN MYKLUSCH	,	
14:46:38 2	Q (Continuing) whether you		
14:46:40 3	have any personal knowledge of any of the		
14:46:43 4	allegations in the Complaint?		
14:46:50 5	A If your question is asking me		
14:46:56 6	whether I am aware of the specific allegations		
14:46:58 7	or any of the specific specifics of the case in		
14:46:59 8	that layer of detail, then the answer is no.		
14:47:60 9	Q Do you know who Peter Hemme		
14:47:06 10	is?		
14:47:08 11	A I believe Peter Hemme is the		
14:47:13 12	Comptroller of Sonus.		
14:47:14 13	Or was the Comptroller, I'm		İ
14:47:16 14	relatively sure he's not today.		
14:47:19 15	Q Do you have any personal		
14:47:57 16	knowledge of any of the allegations that are		
14:48:06 17	made against Mr. Hemme?		
14:48:09 18	A I do not.		}
14:48:17 19	Q Who is the individual at BPI or		
14:48:21 20	Trilogy who has primary oversight		
14:48:22 21	responsibility for this litigation?		
14:48:24 22	A How would you define oversight?		
23	Q What do you understand by that		
24	term?		
25	A If you mean the ability to make		
Ĺ.	1 1012		

11/03/2006

Page 206 14:48:33 JOHN MYKLUSCH 14:48:58 decisions on a going forward basis, would that 14:48:41 be a fair -- so if something were to come about 3 14:48:42 that required a decision by BPI or Trilogy that 14:48:44 this person would have that ability, is that --14:48:47 6 0 I will take that. 14:48:50 7 I would say the two individuals А 14:48:56 8 that I report to, both Carol Holley and Ryan 14:48:59 9 Burrow, would be the people that I would look 14:49:04 10 to inform, in conjunction with counsel, what 14:49:05 11 our potential decisions are and then depending 14:49:06 12 on what they felt, they could then make that 14:49:08 13 decision. 14:49:10 14 Do you have any understanding as 14:49:12 15 to how much time either of those individuals 14:49:19 16 have spent providing such oversight for this 14:49:33 17 litigation? 14:49:34 18 MR. CERA: I object to form. 14:49:40 19 Α No, I don't know offhand. 14:49:43 20 Do you understand that either Q 14:49:44 21 you or those individuals have such 14:49:48 22 responsibility to oversee the conduct of lead 23 Plaintiff counsel? 24 Yes, we understand that we need 25 to watch over the case to make sure the case is

LegaLink Boston, Merrill Legal Solutions (617) 542-0039

Ì.

14:49:56 1	JOHN MYKLUSCH	Page	207
14:49:58 2	progressing in a reasonable manner, to stay		
14:50:01 3	involved.		
14:50:07 4	Q You mentioned the May 2006 order		
14:50:12 5	of the court previously, do you remember that?		
14:50:17 6	A Yes.		
14:50:18 7	Q Are you aware that the Section		
14:50:21 8	10(a) and 10(b)(5) claims against my client		
14:50:27 9	were dismissed?		
14:50:33 10	A I do I was made aware by		
14:50:37 11	counsel that several claims for both Mr. Amed		
14:50:39 12	and Mr. Nill were not upheld by the judge, but		
14:50:41 13	that it's my recollection that several of the		
14:50:42 14	issues were allowed to proceed.		
14:50:42 15	. MR. CERA: Can I hear the answer		
14:51:07 16	back, I just didn't hear.		
14:51:10 17	(The answer requested was read back		
14:51:12 18	by the reporter.)		
14:51:17 19	Q Which claims are you aware that		ļ
14:51:20 20	survived the motion to dismiss?		
14:51:23 21	A I am not aware of which claims		
14:51:27 22	were allowed to survive.		
23	Q Is there anyone within either		
24	Trilogy or BPI that would be aware of the		
25	status of the case vis-a-vis what claims have		

Page 208 14:51:32 1 JOHN MYKLUSCH 14:51:34 2 been upheld and what claims have been 14:51:40 3 dismissed? 14:51:43 4 We rely on counsel to keep us 14:51:55 5 apprised and to tell us what we need to know in 14:52:25 6 relation to the case, to provide us with an 14:52:37 7 appropriate QA, both, we can ask counsel where 14:52:42 8 the case is proceeding. 14:52:43 9 Are you aware of how BPI Global 14:52:44 10 came to engage the Gold Bennett firm? 14:52:45 11 MR. CERA: That was asked and 14:52:46 12 answered previously. You can go ahead 14:52:48 13 and answer. 14:52:50 14 MR. MATULE: It was some time 14:52:52 15 I ask your indulgence. 14:52:57 16 I was not affiliated with BPI at Д 14:53:00 17 the time, so I do not know the exact procedures 14:53:05 18 that we went through to engage counsel. 14:53:09 19 O Have you since come to know? 14:53:12 20 Α I, upon taking over my portion 14:53:16 21 of the case, taking over the responsibility to 14:53:20 22 keep the members of Trilogy informed and 23 follow-up on the case, did have a discussion 24 with counsel about themselves, their 25 qualifications and the case as it stood so far.

## GOLD BENNETT CERA & SIDENER LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW

595 MARKET STREET, SUITE 2300 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105-2835 TELEPHONE (415) 777-2230 TELECOPIER (415) 777-5189

PAMELA A. MARKERT pmarkert@gbcslaw.com

DAVID B. GOLD (1926-1994)

January 18, 2007

## **VIA E-MAIL PDF**

Justin Kemler
Court Reporting Video Production
LegaLink, A Merrill Communications Company
101 Arch Street 3rd Floor
Boston, MA 02110

Re:

In re Sonus Networks Litigation

November 3, 2006 Deposition Transcript of John Francis Myklusch

Dear Mr. Kemler:

On November 29, 2006, we sent you a letter regarding our concerns about the above-referenced transcript originally e-mailed to us on November 22, 2006. While some corrections were made in the revised transcript received by this office on December 20, 2006, several errors remain. According to an email from Donna Barretto of your office, no audiotape was made by the court reporter. Testimony and statements by counsel are effectively lost, and we are left to rely on the recollections of the counsel and deponent who were present. While it is impossible to identify every statement missing from the record, below are objections to the transcript by counsel for Lead Plaintiff.

Page/Line	Error/Omission
	Missing Text
84:22 (originally at 84:14)	Mr. Cera made an objection, but was interrupted by Mr. Matule, who then stated, "I'm sorry, go ahead." Mr. Cera's initial objection is missing.

January 18, 2007 Page 2

Page/Line	Error/Omission
141:22 (originally at 141:12)	The transcript refers to a discussion off the record. This is incorrect. I do not recall making a request to go off the record, and the original transcript sent to our office on November 22, 2006 did not state such a request had been made. I made a detailed objection to Ms. Coffey's questioning of the witness about defendants' request for documents that is missing from the transcript. Counsel for the parties had previously engaged in a lengthy meet and confer about requests for documents and agreed to limit the scope of the documents that would be provided in response to several requests. My statement on the record that the deponent be questioned on the scope of documents to be produced, which were agreed upon subsequent to the initial document requests, and Ms. Coffey's response, are missing in their entirety. The missing dialogue between counsel is critical. We object to the subsequent change to the revised transcript and restate our objection that the dialogue between counsel was improperly omitted by the court reporter.
185:5-6 (Originally at 184:17-18)	While the objection has been added to the record, a portion of the statement attributed to me is unintelligible. There appears to be a transcription error, "I want to again remember we had a meet and confer on this" should say, "I want to again remind everyone we had a meet and confer on this"

In addition to the objections above, Mr. Myklusch has noted the following errata.

<u>PAGE</u>	LINE	CORRECTION		<b>REASON</b>
9 10 14	19 4 7	change "Comptroller" to "Controlle"	er" "	Transcription error.
205 205	12 13	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	"	"
10	17	"and the compliance related" should other compliance related"	d be "and	Clarification
12	11	"into Trilogy" should be "with and Trilogy"	into	Clarification

January 18, 2007 Page 3

12	16-17	"deemed 100 percent of their equity up into Trilogy" should be "contributed their interests in exchange for membership interests in Trilogy"	Clarificatio	n
18	7-8	"I believe a number of my training I received when" should be "I believe I received my training when"	Transcription error	on
37	11	"under the law" should be "under U.S. law.	Clarificatio	n
93	17-18	"an interview" should be "interviews"	Transcription error	on
49 87 120 121	23 22 13-14 17	"Arroyo" should be "Orea" " " " "	Spelling err	or ,, ,,
49 87 120	23 22 13	"Guardine" should be "Guyadeen" " "	Spelling err	or "
42	14	"K-i-l-e-e-n" should be "K-i-l-l-e-e-n"	Spelling err	or

Please ensure that my November 29 letter, Ms. Barretto's email (copy attached) and this letter are included with the certified copy of Mr. Myklusch's deposition transcript.

Very truly yours,

Pamela A. Markert

Encls: November 29, 2006 Letter December 14, 2006 e-mail

cc: Solomon B. Cera, Esq.
Matthew J. Matule, Esq.
James Prendergast, Esq.
John Baraniak, Esq.
Melissa Coffey, Esq.

PAM:keg #116163